

Exhibit 23

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Re: FW: [External] RE: Skinner's Falls Bridge

Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2025 11:56:07 -0400

From: Art Suckewer <asuckewer@knite.com>

To: Hazelton, Susan <shazelton@pa.gov>

CC: Kurnath, Lindsey R <Lindsey_Kurnath@nps.gov>, benjamin.harvey@dot.gov <benjamin.harvey@dot.gov>, michelle.goddard@dot.gov <michelle.goddard@dot.gov>, Crobak, Jennifer (FHWA) <jennifer.crobak@dot.gov>, Gerling, Heather <hgerling@pa.gov>, Russell, Kara <krussell@pa.gov>, Lolli, Amy M <AMLOLLI@pa.gov>, Conway, Michael <michconway@pa.gov>, Ames, John A (Drew) <ajohname@pa.gov>, Thompson, Kristina L <krthompson@pa.gov>, Babinski, Gerard <gbabinski@pa.gov>, Kearns, Thomas J <Thomas_Kearns@nps.gov>, Lisa M. Brozey <Lisa.Brozey@aecom.com>, Radle, Daniel <Daniel.Radle@aecom.com>

Thank you for taking the time to reply, Susan.

I want to address what appears to be two misunderstandings, and then move onto a possibly more fruitful approach that PennDOT was previously on board with.

Briefly, I think you've missed my point. All of my suggestions are based on PennDOT's data. While the measurements since 1991 do show a trend, the recent (within the past two years) measurements are within the margin of error of the measurement techniques and are not unified directionality. Therefore they don't support the consistent shift PennDOT has used to justify the zero rating for the NY abutment. If PennDOT wanted in alternate confirmation of it's analysis suggesting recent structural movement, an alternate dataset is available for at least three years, via InSAR.

Also, the falsework approach was responsive to PennDOT's data and PennDOT's assumptions based on that data. With a partial falsework supporting the span adjacent to the NY abutment, the condition of the superstructure would govern. This would bring the rating temporarily to a two (2), allowing workmen to hang netting from the deck to protect recreational boaters while addressing the NY abutment issues. The pace of restoration in my approach focused on high quality at moderate cost with no environmental impact and no disruption to recreation; to a degree cost can be traded for pace and disruption but safety is always paramount.

I state the prior points for clarification. However, given the timing of ongoing work, further discussion seems counterproductive at this point.

Accordingly, while I feel that the falsework approach is the best and safest way forward for the reasons already stated, PennDOT's original plan was to build a causeway and crane-pick the superstructure for disassembly for subsequent restoration, on shore. PennDOT's justification for demolition was that the bridge could not survive the winter and cranes could not be mobilized before winter. However, the bridge has survived the winter. There will soon be a causeway, so PennDOT has no reason not to revert to the crane-pick disassembly plan. Given the pace the contractor is on, and based on the information and justification PennDOT has released, there is no reason the causeway couldn't be used for a crane pick of the superstructure, as originally proposed. The superstructure would be safely on shore well ahead of the recreation season enabling PennDOT to accomplish its originally-intended plan and to save the bridge from assured destruction.

Thank you again for considering my suggestions.

Sincerely,

Art S.

On 3/24/2025 3:59 PM, Hazelton, Susan wrote:

Mr. Suckewer,

PennDOT has reviewed your proposal below and reviewed the attached rebuttal and has prepared a letter in response. Please see attached word document "SFB- Wrought Iron Bridge Works - Response 3.24.2025".

Thank you, Susan



Susan E Hazelton, P.E. | Assistant District Executive - Design

PA Department of Transportation | Engineering District 4-0
55 Keystone Industrial Park Road | Dunmore, PA 18512
Phone: 570.963.3015 | shazelton@pa.gov

www.pa.gov/pennidot

CONNECT WITH PENNDOT

[Facebook](#) | [X](#) | [Instagram](#) | [YouTube](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

From: Art Suckewer <asuckewer@knite.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2025 11:07 PM

To: Hazelton, Susan <shazelton@pa.gov>

Cc: Kurnath, Lindsey R <Lindsey_Kurnath@nps.gov>; benjamin.harvey@dot.gov; michelle.goddard@dot.gov; Crobak, Jennifer (FHWA) <jennifer.crobak@dot.gov>; Gerling, Heather <hgerling@pa.gov>; Russell, Kara <krussell@pa.gov>; Lolli, Amy M <AMLLOLI@pa.gov>; Conway, Michael <michconway@pa.gov>; Ames, John A (Drew) <johname@pa.gov>; Thompson, Kristina L <krthompson@pa.gov>; Babinski, Gerard <gbabinski@pa.gov>; Kearns, Thomas J <Thomas_Kearns@nps.gov>; Lisa M. Brozey <Lisa.Brozey@aecom.com> <Lisa.Brozey@aecom.com>; Radle, Daniel <Daniel.Radle@aecom.com>

Subject: Re: FW: [External] RE: Skinner's Falls Bridge

Susan Hazelton,

Thank you for your response of Feb. 3. I have replied to your comments in the attached word document in blue. I have also attached two images of the Rt-22 span between Easton and Phillipsburg being built in 1937 (opened 1938), the truss has a span of 540 feet and has multiple lanes. That bridge used falsework on the order you are proposing. Falsework of that magnitude is complete overkill of the lightweight, single lane, bridge with spans of half the length.

PennDOT is set up to efficiently replace old bridges with great new ones but, like most modern state DOTs, is not well equipped to design and oversee the restoration obsolete (historic truss) spans. If historic bridge preservation experts (a niche that is impractical to retain on staff) restored it to meet both AASHTO/engineering standards (except to the bridge's original design limitations), it will meet the need of the crossing, reduce the environmental disturbance that a removal/replacement would entail, could be done more cost effectively than the options presented (meeting the Secretary of Interior's standards without short cuts and exceeding engineering requirements and labor laws) and probably last longer than something modern.

There are ways of doing these sorts of rehabilitations (done regularly in IN and MI). Specifically, doing this type of work as design-build projects, rather than torturing PennDOT with figuring out design solutions. To your organization, these are obsolete white elephants and headaches; while to specialists these obsolete bridges are easy to maintain highly functional gems. After 30 years of expending resources on observing analyzing, seeking consultation and mitigation without significant actual maintenance, PennDOT is trying to get rid of the problem by getting rid of the bridge.

I humbly request you reexamine what I have proposed and assist in finding another path. I can put you in touch with engineers (now retired) from other PennDOT districts that can speak to our knowledge of these structures and their experience with our work.

Please let me know if you are open to this.

Sincerely,

Art S.

On 2/3/2025 3:23 PM, Hazelton, Susan wrote:

Art Suckewer,

Thank you for emailing Amy Lolli regarding Skinners Falls Bridge. PennDOT has reviewed your proposal below and reviewed the attached project information and has prepared a letter in response. Please see attached word document "SFB-Wrought Ironworks Response".

Susan

From: Art Suckewer <asuckewer@knite.com>

Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 5:09 PM

To: Lolli, Amy M <AMLLOLI@pa.gov>; Goddard, Michelle (FHWA) <michelle.goddard@dot.gov>

Cc: Gerling, Heather <hgerling@pa.gov>; Russell, Kara <krussell@pa.gov>

Subject: Re: [External] RE: Skinner's Falls Bridge

Amy,

Thank you for taking my call. I didn't get Mike's email, so please forward this to him as well.

Two bridge projects that we did in PA are of relevance to the emergency situation at Skinner's Falls Bridge: Mead Avenue Bridge and Red Mill Road Bridge.

The removal of the Mead Avenue Bridge Whipple truss superstructure within the easement, but without the use of cranes and no water incursion represents a project of similar scale (shorter but of similar mass and a more complex nature):

<https://www.loc.gov/resource/hhh.pa0377.photos> <https://tile.loc.gov/storage-services/master/png/habshaer/pa/pa0300/pa0377/data/pa0377data.pdf>

Red Mill Road Bridge is more relevant. Of note, it was also an emergency removal due to a failing abutment. The scale was much smaller but the abutment situation was a bit more severe.

I have attached our plan as submitted by Aaron Craig and signed off by the County (owner) for addressing the Red Mill Road Bridge. I have also attached the concluding report for the project.

Regarding Skinner's Falls:

To address the emergency resulting from the failing abutment:

My suggestion is to create/erect a falsework of similar design to that used on Red Mill Road Bridge under the 1/4 - 1/3 of the NYS span which is over land above the low water mark, adjacent the abutment. The falsework would support

the superstructure at the floorbeams and incorporate a hydraulic jacking feature at each attachment point. The falsework itself would rest on specialized bearing plates that do not require footings or significant ground disturbance. These features have significantly expedited permitting on previous projects.

The bearing plates are of sufficient size to reduce the ground load sufficiently to not disturb possible ecological/archeological features below the ground surface and provide sufficient friction to minimize lateral motion once under load.

The hydraulic jacks will allow adjustment and a gradual, minimal stress, unloading of the truss end bearings to safely facilitate abutment work.

Our existing falsework components are available and can be quickly modified to accommodate the specifics of this bridge.

The support of the falsework will also provide adequate safety to deploy netting under the remainder bridge while the abutment is being restored.

Flood protection would be provided by a gabion based deflection/mass system placed upstream (on-shore). Preferably, the falsework would be tied to it via cable.

Responsibility transfer:

One of the dilemmas being faced by PENNDOT is that this is more of a historic preservation project than an infrastructure improvement. However, as this is part of an interstate agreement, its removal creates it's own headaches. By transferring the long term responsibility for the bridge to the NPS (I believe they oversee the Roebling Aqueduct / bridge) or another local organization in a carefully structured agreement, the bridge's care would better align responsibility and purpose for what is a historic artifact. Also, the transfer of ownership/responsibility/liability may allow funds from a different source to be used to fund the restoration.

Restoration:

Assuming there is buy-in, the falsework approach could be implemented to safely and (relatively) cost effectively restore the entire substructure and superstructure.

Using the partial falsework approach, the bridge could be fully restored with a small crew over several years; minimizing risk, cost, environmental and cultural impacts. Techniques similar to those used in Indiana and Michigan would be implemented in order to fully restore the bridge in a manner that will meet both AASHTO and Secretary of the Interior standards. For the restoration, I would recommend the participation of Jim Barker PE (or his associates) as he is the technical editor of the NPS historic bridge restoration guide.

I hope this will be considered by the relevant parties.

Sincerely,

Art S.

On 1/16/2025 11:29 AM, Lolli, Amy M wrote:

Thanks for your interest Art. I will forward your message to the rest of the department and get a response back

Amy M. Lolli, EIT | Assistant Liaison Engineer
Department of Transportation
District Office 4-0
55 Keystone Industrial Park | Dunmore PA 18512
Phone: 570.614.2958 | Fax: 570.963.4949
amlolli@pa.gov
<http://www.pa.gov/pennndot>

-----Original Message-----

From: Goddard, Michelle (FHWA) <michelle.goddard@dot.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 11:20 AM
To: Art Suckewer <asuckewer@knite.com>
Cc: Gerling, Heather <hgerling@pa.gov>; Lolli, Amy M <AMLLOLLI@pa.gov>
Subject: [External] RE: Skinner's Falls Bridge

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown senders.

Hi Art,

Thank you for reaching out about the Skinners Falls bridge. I believe the best point of contacts to discuss your

Thank you,
Michelle

Michelle Goddard, AICP (she/her/hers)
Team Leader - Environment
Federal Highway Administration, Pennsylvania Division
(P) 717-221-3785 | (E) Michelle.Goddard@dot.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Art Suckewer <asuckewer@knite.com>

Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 10:50 AM
To: Goddard, Michelle (FHWA) <michelle.goddard@dot.gov>
Subject: Skinner's Falls Bridge

[You don't often get email from asuckewer@knite.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderProtection>]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Department of Transportation (DOT). Do not click on links or

Dear Ms. Goddard,

I received your contact from Kara Russell of PENNDOT.

I have been involved in rescuing several historic bridges in PA, including a similar (but smaller) bridge at th
I believe we can use derivatives of these methods to quickly and economically resolve the immediate emergency an
Are you available for a phone call to determine if a last minute save is still an option?

Sincerely,

Art S.

--
Art Suckewer
Wrought Iron Bridge Works
Cell (609) 636-3822

--
Art Suckewer
Cell (609) 636-3822

--
Art Suckewer
Cell (609) 636-3822

--
Art Suckewer
Cell (609) 636-3822